

# IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

## Digital Repository

---

Computer Science Technical Reports

Computer Science

---

Spring 2-1-2015

# Automatic Choreography Repair

Samik Basu

Iowa State University, [sbasu@iastate.edu](mailto:sbasu@iastate.edu)

Tevfik Bultan

University of California - Santa Barbara, [bultan@cs.ucsb.edu](mailto:bultan@cs.ucsb.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cs\\_techreports](http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cs_techreports)



Part of the [Software Engineering Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Basu, Samik and Bultan, Tevfik, "Automatic Choreography Repair" (2015). *Computer Science Technical Reports*. 368.  
[http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cs\\_techreports/368](http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cs_techreports/368)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Computer Science at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Computer Science Technical Reports by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [digirep@iastate.edu](mailto:digirep@iastate.edu).

---

# Automatic Choreography Repair

## **Abstract**

Choreography analysis is a crucial problem in concurrent and distributed system development. A choreography specifies the desired ordering of message exchanges among the components of a system. The realizability of a choreography amounts to determining the existence of components whose communication behavior conforms to the given choreography. Recently, the choreography realizability problem has been proved to be decidable. In this paper, we investigate the repairability of un-realizable choreographies, where the goal is to identify a set of changes to a given un-realizable choreography that will make it realizable. We present a technique for automatically repairing un-realizable choreographies and provide formal guarantees of correctness and termination. We show the viability of our technique by applying it successfully for several small but representative unrealizable choreographies from the domain of Singularity OS contract and Web services.

## **Keywords**

Asynchronous Systems, Realizability

## **Disciplines**

Software Engineering

# Automatic Choreography Repair

Samik Basu<sup>1</sup>, Tevfik Bultan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Iowa State University, [sbasu@iastate.edu](mailto:sbasu@iastate.edu)


<sup>2</sup> University of California at Santa Barbara, [bultan@cs.ucsb.edu](mailto:bultan@cs.ucsb.edu)

**Abstract.** Choreography analysis is a crucial problem in concurrent and distributed system development. A choreography specifies the desired ordering of message exchanges among the components of a system. The realizability of a choreography amounts to determining the existence of components whose communication behavior conforms to the given choreography. Recently, the choreography realizability problem has been proved to be decidable. In this paper, we investigate the repairability of unrealizable choreographies, where the goal is to identify a set of changes to a given un-realizable choreography that will make it realizable. We present a technique for automatically repairing un-realizable choreographies and provide formal guarantees of correctness and termination. We show the viability of our technique by applying it successfully for several small but representative unrealizable choreographies from the domain of Singularity OS contract and Web services.

## 1 Introduction

Choreography specifications are used in a variety of domains including coordination of software in service-oriented computing [15], specification of process interactions in Singularity OS [11], and specification of communication behavior among processes in distributed programs [2]. Choreographies describe desired message exchange sequences among components, programs or processes (we will refer to them as *peers*) of a distributed system. Choreography realizability problem is determining whether one can construct peers whose interaction behavior conforms to the given choreography. As an example, consider the choreography over two peers  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  shown in Figure 1(a) where edges represent messages sent from one peer to another. This choreography describes a simple file transfer protocol [9] where  $P_1$  is the client asking for the file transfer and the  $P_2$  is the file server. First, the client sends a message to the server to request that the server starts the transfer. When the transfer is finished, the server sends the “Transfer Finished” message and the protocol terminates. However, the client may decide to cancel the transfer before hearing back from the server by sending a “Cancel Transfer” message in which case the server responds with “Transfer Finished” message, which, again, terminates the protocol.

Figure 2(a) presents the projection of the choreography onto the participating peers resulting in the corresponding peer behaviors (send actions are denoted by “!” and receive actions are denoted by “?”). The distributed system that consists of the peer specifications shown in Figure 2(a) can generate the message sequence:



**Fig. 1.** (a) Un-realizable choreography [9]; Repair by (b) relaxation, (c) restriction.


$$ms^{P_1 \rightarrow P_2}, mf^{P_2 \rightarrow P_1}, mc^{P_1 \rightarrow P_2} \quad (1)$$

This sequence corresponds to the case where the server sends a “Transfer Finished” message ( $mf$ ), but before consuming that message, the client sends the cancellation request message ( $mc$ ). The sequence moves the server to an undefined (error) configuration, where server does not know whether the file was transferred completely to the client before the client sent the cancellation request. In terms of the choreography specification shown in Figure 1(a), the message sequence given above is not covered by the choreography, but any implementation of this choreography that uses asynchronous message passing will generate the message sequence (1), violating the choreography specification. Hence, the choreography specification shown in Figure 1(a) is un-realizable.

**Problem Statement.** This brings up the question: *when a choreography is determined to be un-realizable, is it possible to automatically repair the choreography such that the repaired version is realizable?* We will refer to this problem as the choreography repairability problem. Its importance stems from the fact that automation in repairing choreography will allow faster development of distributed systems with formal guarantees of correctness.

**Our Solution.** At its core, our choreography repair technique depends on examining and analyzing the cause of violation of the condition for deciding choreography realizability. In [4], we have proved that choreography  $\mathcal{C}$  is realizable if its behavior ( $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C})$ ) is identical that exhibited by  $\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}}$  ( $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}})$ ), which is the asynchronous system where each participating peer has at most one pending message and is obtained from the projection of  $\mathcal{C}$ . We present two types of choreography repair mechanisms:

1. *Relaxation.* The choreography  $\mathcal{C}$  is changed to  $\mathcal{C}'$  such that  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}')$ , i.e., new behavior is added to  $\mathcal{C}$ , such that  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}') = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}'})$ .
2. *Restriction.* The choreography  $\mathcal{C}$  is changed to  $\mathcal{C}'$  such that  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}' \downarrow_{\mathcal{C}}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}'} \downarrow_{\mathcal{C}}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}})$ , where  $\downarrow_{\mathcal{C}}$  denotes the behavior projected on the messages in  $\mathcal{C}$ . This change implies that some behavior of  $\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}'}$  is disallowed in  $\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}}$ . This is achieved by adding extra synchronization messages in  $\mathcal{C}'$ . When these extra



**Fig. 2.** (a) Projected Peers  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2$  for Figure 1(a); (b) System Behavior

messages are projected away, the repaired choreography  $\mathcal{C}'$  specifies exactly the same sequences of messages specified by the un-realizable choreography  $\mathcal{C}$ .

The choreography in Figure 1(a) is changed to the one in Figure 1(b) via relaxation, by adding new behavior (blue bold-edge), which makes the latter realizable. This is because the sequence that made  $\mathcal{C}$  un-realizable (see sequence (1) above) is now included in the repaired version  $\mathcal{C}'$ . On the other hand, Figure 1(c) presents repair via restriction, by adding synchronization messages from state  $s_1$  to  $ns(0)$  (red dotted-edges); the restriction also makes the resultant choreography realizable. In this case, the sequence in (1) is not possible in  $\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}'}$ .

**Contribution.** We present a formal characterization of choreography repairability. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time such a characterization has been presented. We present a sound and complete algorithm for choreography repair based on this characterization. Additionally, we develop a prototype implementation of our technique and discuss its application in repairing several unrealizable choreographies.

## 2 Choreography Realizability

We proceed by presenting an overview of our earlier results [4] on choreography realizability, which forms the basis for formalizing its automatic repair strategy.

**Peers.** The behavior  $\mathcal{B}$  of a peer  $P$  is a finite state machine  $(M, T, t_0, \delta)$  where  $M$  is the union of input ( $M^{\text{in}}$ ) and output ( $M^{\text{out}}$ ) message sets,  $T$  is the finite set of states,  $t_0 \in T$  is the initial state, and  $\delta \subseteq T \times (M \cup \{\epsilon\}) \times T$  is the transition relation. A transition  $\tau \in \delta$  can be one of the following three types: (1) a send-transition of the form  $(t_1, !m_1, t_2)$  which sends out a message  $m_1 \in M^{\text{out}}$ , (2) a receive-transition of the form  $(t_1, ?m_2, t_2)$  which consumes a message  $m_2 \in M^{\text{in}}$  from peer's input queue, and (3) an  $\epsilon$ -transition of the form  $(t_1, \epsilon, t_2)$ . We write  $t \xrightarrow{a} t'$  to denote that  $(t, a, t') \in \delta$ . Figure 2(a) illustrates the behavior of peers  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ ; states in  $P_i$  are denoted by a tuple  $(P_i, \text{"state-name"})$ .

**System.** Given a set of peers  $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$  with  $\mathcal{B}_i = (M_i, T_i, t_{0i}, \delta_i)$  denoting the behavior of  $P_i$  and  $M_i = M_i^{\text{in}} \cup M_i^{\text{out}}$  such that  $\forall i : M_i^{\text{in}} \cap M_i^{\text{out}} = \emptyset$ , and  $\forall i, j : i \neq j \Rightarrow M_i^{\text{in}} \cap M_j^{\text{in}} = M_i^{\text{out}} \cap M_j^{\text{out}} = \emptyset$ . A system behavior or simply a system over  $\mathcal{P}$  is denoted by a (possibly infinite state) state machine  $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{P}, S, s_0, M, \Delta)$  where  $\mathcal{P}$  is the set of Peers,  $S$  is the set of states in the system and each state is described by the local states of the peers in  $\mathcal{P}$  and the contents of their queues.  $s_0 \in S$  is the start state, where none of the peers have any pending messages in their queue to consume. The set  $M$  contains the set of all messages that are being exchanged by the participating peers. Finally, the transition relation  $\Delta$  is described as follows. For  $s = (Q_1, t_1, Q_2, t_2, \dots, Q_n, t_n) \in S$  and  $s' = (Q'_1, t'_1, Q'_2, t'_2, \dots, Q'_n, t'_n) \in S$ , where  $t_i$  and  $Q_i$  are the local state and the queue-content of the  $i$ -th peer,

1.  $s \xrightarrow{m^{P_i \rightarrow P_j}} s' \in \Delta$  if  $\exists i, j \in [1..n] : m \in M_i^{\text{out}} \cap M_j^{\text{in}}$ , (i)  $t_i \xrightarrow{!m} t'_i \in \delta_i$ , (ii)  $Q'_j = Q_j m$ , (iii)  $\forall k \in [1..n] : k \neq j \Rightarrow Q_k = Q'_k$  and (iv)  $\forall k \in [1..n] : k \neq i \Rightarrow t'_k = t_k$  [**send action**]
2.  $s \xrightarrow{\epsilon} s' \in \Delta$  if  $\exists i \in [1..n] : m \in M_i^{\text{in}}$  (i)  $t_i \xrightarrow{?m} t'_i \in \delta_i$ , (ii)  $Q_i = m Q'_i$ , (iii)  $\forall k \in [1..n] : k \neq i \Rightarrow Q_k = Q'_k$  and (iv)  $\forall k \in [1..n] : k \neq i \Rightarrow t'_k = t_k$  [**receive action**]
3.  $s \xrightarrow{\epsilon} s' \in \Delta$  if (i)  $\exists i \in [1..n] : t_i \xrightarrow{\epsilon} t'_i \in \delta_i$ , (ii)  $\forall k \in [1..n] : Q_k = Q'_k$  and (iii)  $\forall k \in [1..n] : k \neq i \Rightarrow t'_k = t_k$  [**internal action**]

Each state in the system is described by the local states of the peers along with the status of their queues. The send actions are non-blocking, i.e., when a peer  $P_i$  sends a message  $m$  to a peer  $P_j$  (denoted by  $m^{P_i \rightarrow P_j}$ ), the message gets appended to the tail of the queue associated to  $P_j$  (see item 1(ii)). We refer to the queue as the receive queue of  $P_j$ . The receive actions are blocking, i.e., a peer can only consume a message if it is present at the head of its receive queue (see item 2(ii)). Only the send actions are observable in the system as these actions involve two entities: the sender sending the message and the receive queue of the receiver. All other actions (receive and internal actions) are local to one peer and, therefore, unobservable ( $\epsilon$ -transitions). We will use the functions  $\text{1St}(\cdot, \cdot)$  and  $\text{1Qu}(\cdot, \cdot)$  to obtain local state and queue of a peer from a state in the system, i.e., for  $s = (Q_1, t_1, Q_2, t_2, \dots, Q_n, t_n) \in S$ ,  $\text{1St}(s, P_1) = t_1$  and  $\text{1Qu}(s, P_1) = Q_1$ .

**K-bounded System.** A  $k$ -bounded system (denoted by  $\mathcal{I}_k$ ) is a system where the length of message queue for any peer is at most  $k$ . The description of  $k$ -bounded system behavior is, therefore, realized by augmenting condition 4(a) in

the system behavior (see above) to include the condition  $|Q_j| < k$ , where  $|Q_j|$  denotes the length of the queue for peer  $j$ . In any  $k$ -bounded system, the send actions can block if the receive queue of the receiver peer is full. Any  $k$ -bounded system is finite state as long as the behaviors of the participating peers are finite state. Figure 2(b) illustrates the system  $\mathcal{I}_1$  obtained from the communicating peers  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  of Figure 2(a). Note that initially  $P_1$  is at the local state  $P_1:s_1$  with an empty receive queue denoted by  $[\ ]$ .

**Choreography as Conversation Protocol.** A choreography describes the conversation between peers and is represented by  $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{P}, S^C, s_0^C, L, \Delta^c)$  where  $\mathcal{P}$  is a finite set of peers,  $S^C$  is a finite set of states,  $s_0^C \in S^C$  is the initial state,  $L$  is a finite set of message labels and, finally,  $\Delta^c \subseteq S^C \times \mathcal{P} \times L \times \mathcal{P} \times S^C$  is the transition relation. A transition of the form  $(s_i^C, P, m, P', s_j^C) \in \Delta^c$  represents the sending of message  $m$  from  $P$  to  $P'$  ( $P, P' \in \mathcal{P}$ ).

In [4], we have proved that realizability can be verified by generating behavior of peers obtained by projecting the conversation onto the respective peers and then analyzing their communication pattern.

**Peer Projection.** The projection of a conversation protocol  $\mathcal{C}$  on one of the peers  $P$ , participating in the conversation, is obtained from  $\mathcal{C}$  by performing the following updates to the state machine describing  $\mathcal{C}$ . (a) If a transition label is  $m^{P \rightarrow P'}$  then replace it with  $!m$ ; (b) if a transition label is  $m^{P' \rightarrow P}$  then replace it with  $?m$ ; (c) otherwise, replace transition label with  $\epsilon$ . The system obtained from the asynchronous communication of the projected peers of  $\mathcal{C}$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{I}^C$ ;  $\mathcal{I}_1^C$  being the corresponding 1-bounded system. The language of a choreography conversation or a system is described in terms of set of sequence of send actions of the form  $m^{P \rightarrow P'}$ ; in case of system, the concatenation of  $\epsilon$  to any sequence results in the sequence itself. The language is denoted by  $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ .

**Theorem 1 (Realizability [4]).**  $\mathcal{C}$  is language realizable  $\Leftrightarrow [\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{I}_1^C)]$

The above theorem states that a choreography is realizable if and only if the set of sequences of send actions of a choreography is identical to the set of sequences of send actions of the 1-bounded system where the participating peers are generated from the projection of the choreography under consideration. Figure 2(b) presents the behavior of the system  $\mathcal{I}_1^C$  for the choreography specification  $\mathcal{C}$  shown in Figure 1(a), where epsilon-labeled transitions denote consumption of messages and other transitions denote sending of messages. The choreography  $\mathcal{C}$  is un-realizable because it does not include certain send sequence that is possible in  $\mathcal{I}_1^C$  (Figure 2(b)) (Sequence (1) discussed in Section 1).

### 3 Choreography Repair

It directly follows from Theorem 1 that a choreography  $\mathcal{C}$  is un-realizable if and only if  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}) \neq \mathcal{L}(\text{DETER}(\mathcal{I}_1^C))$ . In the rest of the paper, we will only consider the peer behaviors that are determinized and omit the usage of the function  $\text{DETER}(\cdot)$ . In [4], we have also proved that  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{I}_1^C)$ , therefore,  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}) \neq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{I}_1^C) \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}) \subset \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{I}_1^C)$ .

**Types of Repair.** In this paper, we present two alternative techniques for repairing un-realizable choreographies. One is based on adding new behaviors

(in terms of sends) to  $\mathcal{C}$ , which we call *relaxation*. The other is based on adding constraints that do not alter allowed sequences of sends in  $\mathcal{C}$  but restrict the behavior in  $\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}}$ . We call this approach *restriction*.

**State Relationships between  $\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$ .** Before we describe the relaxation and restriction based repair techniques, we first discuss the structure of the  $\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}}$ , which is crucial for understanding our approach. If a state in  $\mathcal{C}$  is represented as  $s^{\mathcal{C}}$ , then the corresponding state in the peer  $P$  is a tuple denoted by  $P:s^{\mathcal{C}}$ . Proceeding further, if  $s$  is a state in  $\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}}$ , then  $s = (Q_1, t_1, \dots, Q_n, t_n)$ , where  $n$  is the number of peers and  $t_i$  is of the form  $P_i:s_i^{\mathcal{C}}$ . Note that, the local states of each peer in  $s$  may have been obtained from different states  $s_i^{\mathcal{C}}$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Also note that different states in the choreography result in different local states in the peer; however due to determinization these local states may be merged to form one state in the peer. In our technique, we keep track of all the local states (in turn, all the choreography states from which they are generated) of a peer that are merged as a result of determinization.

Consider for example, the second state of the system in Figure 2— $P_1$  is at a state  $P_1:s_1$  obtained from the state  $s_1$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $P_2$  is at a state  $P_2:s_0$  obtained from the state  $s_0$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Using the notations introduced in Section 2,  $\text{1St}((P_1:s_1:[ ], P_2:s_0:[ms]), P_1) = P_1:s_1$ .

### 3.1 Differences between $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}}$

In order to apply relaxation or restriction, it is important to identify at least one difference between  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}}$  in terms of sequences of send actions. We know that for un-realizable  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}) \subset \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}})$ . Therefore, there exists at least one send sequence in  $\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}}$  which is absent in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Consider that there exists a path in  $\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}}$  in the form

$$s_1 \xrightarrow{m_1^{P_1 \rightarrow P'_1}} s_2 \xrightarrow{m_2^{P_2 \rightarrow P'_2}} s_3 \rightarrow \dots s_i \xrightarrow{m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}} s_{i+1} \quad (2)$$

which generates the following sequence of send actions  $m_1^{P_1 \rightarrow P'_1}, m_2^{P_2 \rightarrow P'_2}, \dots, m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}$ . Assume that, none of the paths in  $\mathcal{C}$  allow the above send sequence. However, there exists a path in  $\mathcal{C}$  which replicates the above sequence till  $m_{i-1}^{P_{i-1} \rightarrow P'_{i-1}}$ . Let such a path be denoted by

$$t_1 \xrightarrow{m_1^{P_1 \rightarrow P'_1}} t_2 \xrightarrow{m_2^{P_2 \rightarrow P'_2}} t_3 \rightarrow \dots t_{i-1} \xrightarrow{m_{i-1}^{P_{i-1} \rightarrow P'_{i-1}}} t_i \quad (3)$$

where  $t_i$  does not have any outgoing transition labeled by  $m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}$ . In summary, one of the differences between the send sequences present in  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}}$  is due to the presence of send action  $m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}$  at  $s_i$  and absence of the same at  $t_i$ . For instance, going back to the example in Figure 2, the difference between  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}}$  is due to  $ms^{P_1 \rightarrow P_2}, mf^{P_2 \rightarrow P_1}, mc^{P_1 \rightarrow P_2}$ , in which case  $s_i$  is equal to  $(P_1:s_1:[mf], P_2:s_3:[ ])$  in  $\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $t_i$  is equal to  $s_3$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

The cause of the difference between the behaviors can be explained in one of the two ways:

**Independent Branches.** The choreography specification includes a branching behavior involving sends from at least two peers in two different branches. The sender peers follow different paths in the branches. This is the case in Figure 1(a).



**Independent Sequences.** The choreography specification includes a path where there are two messages sent by two different peers and the sender of the second message does not (directly/indirectly) depend on the first message. This situation can be illustrated using the following choreography specification:

$$t_0 \xrightarrow{m^{P_1 \rightarrow P_2}} t_1 \xrightarrow{m^{P_3 \rightarrow P_4}} t_2.$$

The first and second transitions correspond to send actions of  $P_1$  and  $P_3$ , which can occur in any order in the corresponding system and the choreography specification (as it stands), therefore, cannot be realized. We will refer to the path as independent sequences and the transitions as *independent transitions*.

The objective of repair via relaxation or restriction is to alter the behavior of  $\mathcal{C}$  proceeding from  $t_i$  such that the above causes of differences can be eliminated.

### 3.2 Repair by Relaxation

As noted before, relaxing  $\mathcal{C}$  corresponds to adding new behaviors to  $\mathcal{C}$ . Specifically, adding a new behavior from state  $t_i$  (in path (3) above) implies adding a transition from  $t_i$  to some  $t'_i$  with transition label  $m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}$ . The addition of such a new transition obviously results in a new choreography specification, say  $\mathcal{C}'$ . We will denote relaxation of  $\mathcal{C}$  to  $\mathcal{C}'$  as  $\mathcal{C} \nearrow \mathcal{C}'$ . Note that, the following holds:  $\mathcal{C} \nearrow \mathcal{C}' \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}')$ .

While adding a new transition from  $t_i$  eliminates the difference due to the send action  $m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}$ , the important next step is to identify a suitable  $t'_i$ . There are two possibilities: we can either assign  $t'_i$  to some existing state in  $\mathcal{C}$  or generate a new state. Careful selection of one of the two choices is important because it impacts the termination of the repair mechanism (see Section 3.4). Using the form of the system path shown in (2), let  $\text{1St}(s_i, P_i) = P_i : c_i$ ;  $\text{1St}(s_{i+1}, P_i) = P_i : c_{i+1}$ ;  $\text{1Qu}(s_i, P_i) = Q_i$ ;  $\text{1Qu}(s_{i+1}, P_i) = Q_{i+1}$ .

In the above,  $Q_i = Q_{i+1}$  because the peer  $P_i$  does not consume any messages at this transition.

**Case 1. Consider that the receive queue  $Q_i$  of the peer  $P_i$  is non-empty**, implying that there is one pending message to be consumed (recall that the  $\mathcal{I}_1^C$  is 1-bounded system with each receive queue capacity being 1). In other words, some peer (say,  $R$ ) has sent the message (say  $m$ ) to  $P_i$  and  $P_i$  has not encountered any receive action along the choreography path it has taken resulting in system path shown in (2).

This case corresponds to the situation described as *independent branching* (see above), when peer  $P_i$  is moving along a choreography specification path  $\pi$  and the other peer  $R$  is moving along a different path  $\pi'$  of the choreography specification, resulting in the path shown in (2). Furthermore,  $R$  has sent  $m$  to  $P_i$  which resides un-consumed in the receive queue of  $P_i$ .

**Case 1a.** Let there be a transition in the behavior of peer  $P_i$  at state  $P_i : c_{i+1}$ , where it can consume the message in its queue:  $P_i : c_{i+1} \xrightarrow{?m} P_i : c'_i$ . That is, the choreography specification includes  $c_{i+1} \xrightarrow{m^{R \rightarrow P_i}} c'_i$  along the path  $\pi$ . Therefore, both of the paths under consideration,  $\pi$  and  $\pi'$ , have the send action  $m^{R \rightarrow P_i}$ . In  $\pi$   $m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}$  is followed by  $m^{R \rightarrow P_i}$ . In  $\pi'$   $m^{R \rightarrow P_i}$  is not followed by  $m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}$ .

In this case, the relaxation adds  $t_i \xrightarrow{m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}} t'_i$  in the choreography specification and sets  $t'_i$  to  $c'_i$ .

**Case 1b.** On the other hand, if there exists no transition in the behavior of peer  $P_i$  starting from state  $P_i:c_{i+1}$  where it can consume the message in its queue, then the following repair is done.

**Case 1b-i.** If  $P_i:c_{i+1}$  belongs to a cycle then in the newly added transition

$t_i \xrightarrow{m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}} t'_i$ ,  $t'_i$  is set to a new state, which replicates the choreography specification starting from  $c_{i+1}$ . Note that, the repair does not assign  $t'_i$  to  $c_{i+1}$ . This is because such assignment will result in unnecessary over-relaxation of choreography specification due to the presence in  $m^{R \rightarrow P_i}$  in path  $\pi'$  and its possible absence in the cycle which is part of the path  $\pi$ . We will discuss below this scenario using the example in Figure 3.


**Case 1b-ii.** If  $P_i$  at  $P_i:c_{i+1}$  cannot consume the pending message and  $P_i:c_{i+1}$  does not belong to any cycle, then  $t'_i$  is set to a newly generated state. The addition of new transition removes the identified difference between the choreography and the system.

**Example.** Consider the example in Figure 2. The path in  $\mathcal{I}_1^C$  (Figure 2) that is absent in  $\mathcal{C}$  (Figure 1(a)):

$$(P_1:s_0:[], P_2:s_0:[]) \xrightarrow{ms^{P_1 \rightarrow P_2}} (P_1:s_1:[], P_2:s_0:[ms]) \xrightarrow{mf^{P_2 \rightarrow P_1}} (P_1:s_1:[mf], P_2:s_3:[]) \xrightarrow{mc^{P_1 \rightarrow P_2}} (P_1:s_2:[mf], P_2:s_3:[mc])$$

Note that, we have considered only the send actions and the transitions are considered with zero or more occurrences of  $\epsilon$  followed by a send action. The path in  $\mathcal{C}$  that replicates most of this sequence is  $s_0 \xrightarrow{ms^{P_1 \rightarrow P_2}} s_1 \xrightarrow{mf^{P_2 \rightarrow P_1}} s_3$ . Therefore, for repair by relaxation, our objective is to add a transition with send action  $mc^{P_1 \rightarrow P_2}$  from the choreography state  $s_3$ . From the system, we know that the peer  $P_1$  at the state  $P_1:s_2$  can consume the message  $m_f$  in its receive queue and move to a state in  $P_1:s_4$  (see Figure 2). Therefore, the transition added from  $s_3$  has the destination state  $s_4$ . The result of this repair by relaxation is the choreography specification presented in Figure 1(b). This illustrates the **Case 1a** of repair by relaxation.

Figure 3 illustrates the applications of **Case 1b-i** and **1a**. The local states of the peers participating in the system transitions are presented in bold-font. In the first step, the difference between the system transition sequence and the choreography sequence is repaired following the Case 1b-i.  $P_1:s_2$  does not have a transition where it consumes the pending message  $n_1$ , and  $P_1:s_2$  belongs to a cycle. Therefore, a new state  $ns(0)$  replicating  $s_2$  is generated as part of the repair strategy instead of adding the transition  $m_1^{P_1 \rightarrow P_2}$  from  $s_3$  to  $s_2$ . This is because the latter will result in unnecessary over-relaxation of the choreography. Assume that the  $m_1^{P_1 \rightarrow P_2}$  is directly connected to  $s_2$  after the first step of the repair. Then in the following step, application of Case 1a will result in addition of



**Fig. 3.** Example illustrating application of Case 1b-ii and 1a of relaxation

$n_1^{P_2 \rightarrow P_1}$  from  $s_2$  to  $s_2$ , which will allow arbitrary number of  $m_1$  and  $n_1$  messages at state  $s_2$ . While this will make the choreography realizable, it also relaxes the behavior more than necessary for realizability. As shown in Figure 3(b), a valid repair does not require arbitrary number of  $n_1$  messages at state  $s_2$ .  $\square$

**Case 2.** Now consider that the receive queue  $Q_i$  of the peer  $P_i$  is empty, implying that there is no pending message to be consumed. Unlike the previous case, in this situation, the difference between  $\mathcal{I}_1^C$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  (represented by paths (2) and (3) in Section 3.1) is *not necessarily* due to independent branches, when two peers move along two different paths of the choreography specification.

Instead the peers may be moving along the same path of the choreography specification, and the latter has imposed an “un-realizable” ordering of send actions involving  $m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}$ . In other words, it is not possible to “stop”  $P_i$  from sending the message  $m_i$  from its projected behavior when the choreography specification reaches  $t_i$ , however  $t_i$  does not have  $m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}$ . This corresponds to the case of independent sequences (see above).

Recall that, the choreography specification state is  $t_i$  from where there is no matching  $m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}$  event. We check whether there exists a path from  $P_i : t_i$  (i.e., local state of  $P_i$  obtained from projection at  $t_i$ ) to  $P_i : t_i$  in the peer  $P_i$  via a sequence of transitions such that after a sequence of  $\epsilon$ -transitions, there is a  $!m_i$  transition followed by some other sequence of transitions.

**Case 2a.** If the check is successful, then we can infer that  $t_i$  is part of a loop and it contains independent transitions, which cause un-realizability.

- **Case 2a-i.** Then we identify the first intermediate state  $P_i : t$  in this loop, which has an outgoing transition over some other output action. In this case, a new transition  $t_i \xrightarrow{m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}} t'_i$  with  $t'_i$  set to  $t$  is added to replicate the behavior in  $\mathcal{I}_1^C$ .

- **Case 2a-ii.** If no such intermediate state exists, then  $t_i \xrightarrow{m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}} t'_i$  with  $t'_i$  set to  $t_i$  (self-loop) is added.

In either case, the permutations of pairs of independent transitions that were identified as the difference between  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_1^C$  are added and nothing else.

**Case 2b.** On the other hand, if the check is unsuccessful, then we can infer that  $t_i$  is not part of a loop.

- **Case 2b-i.** We find out whether  $P:c_{i+1}$  (local state of the sender at  $s_{i+1}$ ) has a path to  $P:t_i$  ( $t_i$  being the choreography state that cannot replicate the behavior of the system from  $s_i$ ). If such path exists in the behavior of  $P_i$ , we infer that  $P_i$  moves along a path different from  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_i$  (see path 3) in choreography but the path has the ability to join at  $t_i$ . In this case, we

add a new transition labeled with  $t_i \xrightarrow{m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}} c_{i+1}$  to remove the difference between the choreography and corresponding the system.

- **Case 2b-ii.** If the condition in Case 2b-i fails, then we find out the choreography state reachable from  $c_{i+1}$  (the choreography state corresponding the senders local state at  $s_{i+1}$ ) via the action  $m_{i-1}^{P_{i-1} \rightarrow P'_{i-1}}$ . If such a state is  $t$ , then this implies that the choreography path extending from  $c_{i+1}$  allows  $m_{i-1}^{P_{i-1} \rightarrow P'_{i-1}}$  after  $m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}$ , while the choreography path along  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_i$  (see path 3) does not allow  $m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}$  after  $m_{i-1}^{P_{i-1} \rightarrow P'_{i-1}}$ . The repair in this case

is similar to Case 1a and amounts to adding  $t_i \xrightarrow{m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}} t$ .

On the other hand, if no such choreography state  $t$  exists, then a new state is generated and a transition over  $m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}$  is added from  $t_i$  to this newly generated state.

Figure 4 illustrates the application of Case 2 of relaxation.


### 3.3 Repair by Restriction

The objective of restriction, unlike relaxation, is to constraint the behavior of the system  $\mathcal{I}_1^C$ . In other words, going back to paths (3) and (2) in Section 3.1,

restriction implies disallowing the transition  $s_i \xrightarrow{m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}} s_{i+1}$  in  $\mathcal{I}_1^C$  i.e., introducing restriction to disallow the transition  $c_i \xrightarrow{m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}} c'_i$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  from happening at the system state  $s_i$ , where  $\text{1St}(s_i, P_i) = P_i:c_i$  and  $\text{1St}(s_{i+1}, P_i) = P_i:c_{i+1}$ . The restriction of transition  $c_i \xrightarrow{m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}} c'_i$  is achieved by adding a new intermediate state between  $c_i$  and  $c'_i$ .

**Case 1.** Let  $t_i$  has a transition to  $t$  where some peer  $P$  sends a message  $m$  to  $P'$  and  $P$  is different from  $P_i$ , the sender peer of the message  $m_i$ . We verify whether the transition  $c_i \xrightarrow{m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}} c_{i+1}$  is reachable from  $t$ .

If the verification is successful, this corresponds to the case of unrealizability due to *independent transitions*. The repair, in this case, results from the addition



**Fig. 4.** Example illustrating application of Case 2a of Relaxation

of an intermediate state between  $t_i$  and  $t$  such that  $t_i \xrightarrow{m^{P \rightarrow P'}} ns \xrightarrow{nm^{P' \rightarrow P_i}} t$ , where  $nm$  is a new message and  $ns$  is a new state. Addition of such transitions will disallow the  $m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}$  at the system state  $s_i$ .

**Case 2.** However, if there is no transition from the state  $t_i$  or the transition is labeled with a send action performed by the same peer  $P_i$ , then it corresponds to the case of unrealizability due to *independent branches*. In this case, we identify the sender peer  $P_{i-1}$  for the transition from  $t_{i-1}$  to  $t_i$ . The restriction is achieved by introducing an intermediate state between  $c_i$  and  $c_{i+1}$  as follows:  $c_i \xrightarrow{nm^{P_{i-1} \rightarrow P_i}} ns \xrightarrow{m_i^{P_i \rightarrow P'_i}} c_{i+1}$ , where  $nm$  and  $ns$  are newly added message and newly added state, respectively.

These newly added messages and transitions in the choreography can be viewed as an extra step which forces the peer  $P_i$  to come in sync with some other peer ( $P'$  in Case 1a above and  $P$  in Case 1b and 2 above) before sending the message  $m_i$ . We refer to such extra step as the *synchronization step*.

We will denote restriction of  $\mathcal{C}$  to generate  $\mathcal{C}'$  as  $\mathcal{C} \searrow \mathcal{C}'$ . It is immediate that

$$\mathcal{C} \searrow \mathcal{C}' \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}' \downarrow_{\mathcal{C}}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}') \wedge \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}'} \downarrow_{\mathcal{C}}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}}) \quad (4)$$

The operation  $\mathcal{C}' \downarrow_{\mathcal{C}}$  extracts the behavior with respect to actions present in  $\mathcal{C}$ . The restriction does not alter the behavior of the choreography in terms of the actions in  $\mathcal{C}$  but restricts the behavior of the corresponding system in terms of the actions in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Example.** Figure 1(c) presents the result of applying restriction based repair of the choreography in Figure 1(a). There exists a path in the system where it

---

**Algorithm 1**

---

```
1: procedure REPAIR( $\mathcal{C}$ , inputRepairMechanism)
2:   Compute  $\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}}$ 
3:   if  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}})$  then                                 $\triangleright$  No Need to Repair
4:     return  $\mathcal{C}$                                                      $\triangleright$   $\mathcal{C}$  is realizable
5:   end if
6:   Find a difference between  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_1^{\mathcal{C}}$                              $\triangleright$  Sec.3.1
7:   Apply  $\mathcal{C}$  inputRepairMechanism  $\mathcal{C}'$                              $\triangleright$  Sec.3.2, 3.3
8:    $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{C}'$ 
9:   GOTO Line 2                                                     $\triangleright$  Iterate
10: end procedure
```

---

reaches the state  $P_1 : s_1 : [mf], P_2 : s_3 : []$  via the send sequence  $ms^{P_1 \rightarrow P_2}, mf^{P_2 \rightarrow P_1}$ ; from this state, the system is capable of producing  $mc^{P_1 \rightarrow P_2}$  (see Figure 2). The choreography via the same sequence of sends reaches the state  $s_3$ . Therefore, the restriction is achieved by following the Case 2 above resulting in a repaired choreography in Figure 1(c).  $\square$

### 3.4 Iterative Algorithm


It is necessary to apply the relaxation or the restriction iteratively till a realizable choreography is obtained and all differences between the choreography and the corresponding 1-bounded system behavior have been resolved. Algorithm 1 is an iterative algorithm for choreography repair, where the input parameter “inputRepairMechanism” is either set to  $\nearrow$  (relaxation) or  $\searrow$  (restriction). Figures 3 and 4 illustrate the application of Algorithm 1.

**Theorem 2 (Correctness).** *The algorithm REPAIR is guaranteed to terminate and produce a repaired (i.e., realizable) choreography.*

*Proof Sketch.* The algorithm terminates only when the condition at Line 3 is satisfied. Termination depends on the number of new states that get generated as part of the repair, which, in turn, depends directly on the number of independent branches and independent transitions. The number of independencies are bounded by the number of branches and the maximum length of a path (with one unfolding) in the choreography, which ensures the boundedness in the introduction of new states, and therefore, termination.  $\square$

## 4 Prototype Implementation

We have implemented Algorithm 1. The tool and the examples are available at <http://fmg.cs.iastate.edu/project-pages/async/#rc>. All results and diagrams used in this paper are automatically generated by our implementation of Algorithm 1 and a prototype output generation module. Note that the repairing mechanism only considers the transitions and their labels; therefore, some repairs may not capture the semantics of the choreographies being repaired. For instance, Figure 5(a) presents a client-server contract from Singularity OS. It presents the desired conversation patterns between a client requesting a communication with the server. This contract is un-realizable. A possible repaired version is presented in Figure 5(b). The added bold blue edges resulting from relaxation do



**Fig. 5.** (a) ReservationSession Contract, (b) repaired, (c) repaired with semantics

not follow the semantics of the messages being exchanged. Consider the new path in the conversation:  $\text{start} \xrightarrow{\text{request}^{C \rightarrow S}} \text{decide} \xrightarrow{\text{cancel}^{C \rightarrow S}} \text{decide0} \xrightarrow{\text{succeed}^{S \rightarrow C}} \text{end}$ , where the server sends a “succeed” message even after the client sends a “cancel” message. This is present in the repair in order to allow any order of “succeed” and “cancel” messages (as “succeed” followed by “cancel” is allowed in the original contract). However, the ordering introduced by repair may not align with the requirements of the designer of the contract. One can, therefore, incorporate certain application-domain specific information from the user such that relaxations can be guided appropriately.

For instance, if the user had provided additional information that “cancel” can never be followed by “succeed”, then relaxation would have been impossible and the only choice for removing difference between the un-realizable choreography and the corresponding 1-bounded system will be restriction. We have incorporated such domain knowledge in our implementation. Figure 5(c) presents an alternate solution for repairing the contract in Figure 5(a). Observe that in this solution, a combination of relaxation and restriction has been applied.

It is worth mentioning two important aspects of user-centered repairing mechanism. Firstly, note that the role of a user is likely to be limited in most scenarios; typically, users should review the result obtained via automated repairing technique and then decide whether or not to incorporate additional information in the repairing technique. Once such information is incorporated, the process of repair again proceeds automatically. Secondly, information provided by the user may not allow relaxation in certain cases (due to constraints in the ordering of messages, see above), as a result of which the automatic method will use repair by restriction to remove certain causes of unrealizability. This, in turn, implies the usage of both relaxation and restriction in the Algorithm 1 for repairing an unrealizable choreography. The termination result follows immediately from the following two-step view of the iterative algorithm. First, apply relaxations to resolve as many differences between choreography and 1-bounded projected system without violating the user-provided constraints and then apply the restrictions to resolve the rest of the differences. The process ensures that finite number of application of relaxation and restriction leads to a repaired choreography.

## 5 Related Work

Realizability of choreographies has been studied before. The authors in [7, 9] use state machine base specifications while the authors in [10, 6] use session types; both present sufficient conditions for realizability. In [4], we have proved the decidability of choreography realizability in terms of send sequences<sup>3</sup> problem by presenting a necessary and sufficient condition for realizability.

In [14], the realizability of choreography requires the developer to specify a “dominant” process for each branch and loop construct, which allows the projection mechanism to synthesize necessary synchronization messages between the dominant process and others. Similarly, techniques proposed in [13, 16, 8, 3, 12] rely on introducing new processes, monitors and central controllers to ensure realizability. These may not be viable options if one is using a distributed computing paradigm and can be conservative in the sense that unnecessary synchronization messages are added even for realizable choreographies.

The repair or amendment technique developed by authors in [12] focuses on process algebraic description of choreography; however, the description does not take into consideration iterations and recursions, which makes the technique not applicable for general choreography behavior containing cycles.

In contrast, our work does not require introduction of new processes, does not require a central controller, and does not require use of synchronous communication between any entities/peers. As our technique is based on finite state machines and their language equivalence, it is applicable to choreographies and interactions which are specified at different levels of abstractions, such as session-types [10] and collaboration diagrams [5], as long as these specifications are translated to state-machine based representation described in [4] and used in this paper.

---

<sup>3</sup> Note that, the realizability problem for the MSC-graphs, which considers both send and receive actions for realizability, is undecidable [1].



## 6 Conclusion

We present techniques for automatically repairing unrealizable choreographies based on two strategies: 1) relaxation, where new behaviors are added to the choreography as part of the repair and 2) restriction, where un-desired (not specified by the choreography) behaviors in the system obtained by projecting the choreography are removed as part of the repair. We prove that our repair algorithm always terminates with a realizable choreography. To the best of our knowledge, our method is the first to consider automatic repairing of choreographies and provide formal guarantees of correctness.

## References

1. R. Alur, K. Etessami, and M. Yannakakis. Realizability and verification of MSC graphs. In *Proc. 28th Int. Colloq. on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 797–808, 2001.
2. J. Armstrong. Getting Erlang to talk to the outside world. In *Proc. ACM SIGPLAN Workshop on Erlang*, pages 64–72, 2002.
3. M. Autili, D. Ruscio, A. Salle, P. Inverardi, and M. Tivoli. A model-based synthesis process for choreography realizability enforcement. In *Fundamental Approaches to Software Engineering*, pages 37–52, 2013.
4. S. Basu, T. Bultan, and M. Ouederni. Deciding choreography realizability. In *ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, 2012.
5. T. Bultan and X. Fu. Specification of realizable service conversations using collaboration diagrams. In *Service Oriented Computing and Applications*, 2008.
6. P.-M. Denielou and N. Yoshida. Multiparty session types meet communicating automata. In *In Proceedings of ESOP*, 2012.
7. X. Fu, T. Bultan, and J. Su. Conversation protocols: A formalism for specification and verification of reactive electronic services. In *Proc. of the 8th Int. Conf. on Implementation and Application of Automata (CIAA)*, 2003.
8. M. Gdemann, G. Salan, and M. Ouederni. Counterexample guided synthesis of monitors for realizability enforcement. In *Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis*, pages 238–253. Springer, 2012.
9. S. Hall and T. Bultan. Realizability analysis for message-based interactions using shared-state projections. In *SIGSOFT Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2010.
10. K. Honda, N. Yoshida, and M. Carbone. Multiparty Asynchronous Session Types. In *Proceedings of Symposium Principles of Programming Languages*, 2008.
11. G. C. Hunt and J. R. Larus. Singularity: rethinking the software stack. *Operating Systems Review*, 41(2):37–49, 2007.
12. I. Lanese, F. Montesi, and G. Zavattaro. Amending choreographies. In *Automated Specification and Verification of Web Systems*, 2013.
13. N. Lohmann and K. Wolf. Realizability is Controllability. In *Proc. 1st Central-European Work. on Services and Their Composition*, pages 61–67, 2009.
14. Z. Qiu, X. Zhao, C. Cai, and H. Yang. Towards the theoretical foundation of choreography. In *In Proceedings of Conference on World Wide Web*, 2007.
15. Web Service Choreography Description Language (WS-CDL). <http://www.w3.org/TR/ws-cdl-10/>, 2005.
16. Y. Yoon, C. Ye, and H.-A. Jacobsen. A distributed framework for reliable and efficient service choreographies. In *Proceedings of the 20th international conference on World wide web, WWW ’11*, pages 785–794. ACM, 2011.